DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 301 220 IR 052 566

AUTHOR Vocino, Michael, Jr.; Kellogg, Martha H.
TITLE Student Employees in Academic Libraries: Premise and Potential.
PUB DATE 87
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Libraries; Budgeting; Higher Education; Job Training; Labor Turnover; *Library Personnel; Library Statistics; Library Surveys; Literature Reviews; *Performance; Policy; Questionnaires; *Staff Role; *Student Evaluation; *Supervision; Work Study Programs
IDENTIFIERS *University of Rhode Island

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of two surveys undertaken at the University of Rhode Island (URI) Libraries over a 2-year time period, one addressed to URI library student employees, and the other to their supervisors. Of the 171 students and 20 staff supervisors who received questionnaires, 144 students (84.21%) and 19 supervisors (95%) responded. The questionnaires sought information on: (1) who the typical student employees are; (2) the conditions of their employment as perceived by the students themselves and the staff who hire, supervise, and train them; (3) whether this sizeable workforce is being utilized effectively; and (4) whether any questions posed or conclusions drawn from the URI library student employee experience can be applied universally to similar situations in other academic libraries. Staff members were asked specifically about the initial hiring of student employees; their training and supervision; their retention; and benefits/disadvantages of student workers. The results of the two surveys are summarized and compared with the results of previous studies reported in the literature. It is concluded that academic libraries, rather than mismanaging the student workforce as reported in most of the literature, are investing the optimum amount of resources necessary to assure the continued effective and efficient functioning of the institution. Appended are copies of student and staff questionnaires; a student performance evaluation form; and a memorandum to student library employees. (9 references) (CGD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED301220

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

STUDENT EMPLOYEES IN ACADEMIC LIBRARIES: PREMISE AND POTENTIAL

by

Michael Vocino, Jr.
Chair, Technical Services
The University of Rhode Island Libraries

and

Martha H. Kellogg
Assistant Acquisitions Librarian
The University of Rhode Island Libraries

IR052524

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Martha H.Kellogg
Michael Vocino, Jr.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

This study undertakes to answer the following questions: who are the typical student employees? What are the conditions of their employment as perceived by the students themselves and the staff who hire, supervise and train them? Is this sizeable workforce being utilized effectively? Can any questions posed or conclusions drawn from the University of Rhode Island Library student employee experience be applied universally to other academic libraries? To answer these questions and others, a survey of URI Library student employees and another survey of their supervisors were conducted during the past two years. This study presents the results of the two surveys in hopes of answering a universal question posed many times in the library literature over the past twenty years, "Are we efficiently and effectively using our student employees?"

(Included in attached appendices: "URI Library Student Workers: a Questionnaire"; "Library Student Employment--Staff Questionnaire"; "University Library Student Performance Evaluation Form"; and "Memorandum to Student Library Employees". 22p.)

INTRODUCTION

Student workers are a necessary component of the human resources needed for an efficient and effective academic library workplace. Students are used for a variety of library tasks ranging from the most mundane of clerical duties to assisting professional librarians at public service desks. The professional literature over the last twenty years agrees that academic libraries need students for complete staffing but also faults those libraries for mismanaging the student workforce.

Such studies in the professional literature are, of course, theoretically correct. In many cases more should be done with our student employees but the realities of marketplace economics, the pool of students available for library employment, and student requirements conflict with and contradict many theoretical proposals proffered over the last twenty years. Academic libraries do use their student workforce as effectively as present conditions allow. Once the student population we employ is identified, and once we understand how they are trained and evaluated, it becomes easier to understand why we cannot develop "colleagues" of our students as some of the literature suggests.

The most effective and efficient use of 70 percent of its employees is of concern to the University of Rhode Island (URI) Library as it is to virtually every other academic library system. URI is a medium-sized land grant university in the Northeast with an enrollment of approximately 12,000 undergraduate students and 2,800 graduate students, with a full-time faculty of about 730. The URI Library has a collection of some 850,000 volumes and a staff of 62

full-time employees, 20 faculty and 42 classified staff. The Library also hires approximately 170 part-time student employees each year. In terms of numbers, the student employees constitute approximately 73% of the Library's workforce.

Who are the typical student employees? What are the conditions of their employment as perceived by the students and the staff who hire, supervise and train them? Is this sizeable workforce being utilized effectively by the Library? Can any questions posed or conclusions drawn from the URI student employee experience be applied universally to other academic libraries?

To answer these questions and others, a survey of URI Library student employees and another survey of their supervisors was conducted during the Fall 1986 and the Fall 1987 semesters.[1] This study will present the results of the two surveys in hopes of answering a universal question posed many times in the library literature over the past twenty years, "Are we efficiently and effectively using our student employees?"

Student Employee Questionnaire

Students at the University of Rhode Island Library are paid monthly. Each month students report to the administrative offices of the Library for their checks. Students filled out the survey at the time of receiving their checks. A large box was placed on a table in the area and students were asked to complete questionnaires before leaving. Of the 171 students receiving questionnaires, 144 returned them with varying degrees of completeness. The return rate was 84.21%

Responses

Of the responses, 64.6% were College Work-Study Program (CWS) participants, and 35.4% were paid on the regular institutional payroll (IPR). Of the students, 67.5% reported themselves as Rhode Island residents; 28.5% are from other states. A small percentage (3.8%) report themselves as non-U.S. citizens. Males comprise 26.1% of the students and 70.7% are female (the discrepancies are no responses). The distribution among classes is: freshmen, 32.3%; sophomores, 16.9%; juniors, 29.2%; seniors, 12.3% and graduate students, 6.1%. Length of service was reported as: one semester, 52.3%; one year, 10.7%; two years, 20.0%; three years, 10.7% and four years, 4.6%. Only 18.4% reported that they had previous library work experience. Of those responding, 40.0% said they were given adequate training, while 56.9% said they received no formal training and 3.1% chose not to respond.

Over 70% of the students responding to the survey were assigned to the public services sector of the library (reference, 4.5%; government publications office, 3.8%; microforms, 7%; circulation desk, 19.3%; stacks, 13.5%; reserves, 14.8%; security, 5.1%; interlibrary loan, 1.9%; and the media room, 1.2%.) The remainder of the students, except for a few assigned to the administrative offices, work in those areas assigned to the technical services department (acquisitions, 5.7%; periodicals, 3.8%; cataloging, 7.7%; bindery, 2.5%; processing, 3.2%; mailroom, .6%; and special collections, 2.5%).

The majority of students responded to the question about fields of study. Fifty percent of the responding students are studying in the social sciences; 21%, the physical sciences; 17%, the life sciences and 12% in humanities. Of those responding, 47.3% felt as

though their work in the library has helped them in their academic studies. Nearly half (46.5%) said working in the library was of no help in their academic studies.

The "Typical" Student Employee

We can assume from the above statistics that the composite of a URI Library student worker would produce a female majoring in one of the social sciences. She is likely to be a freshman or sophomore and is part of the CWS program. She is a Rhode Island resident with a year or less experience working at the URI Library. She probably has had no previous library work experience and said she received no "formal" training for her work at the URI Library.

The URI survey offers other kinds of information about student workers which goes beyond, as well as includes, specific individual characteristics. For example, students work an average of 10.5 hours per week. The greatest number of hours a student works is 20/wk and the least is 4/wk. The highest percentage of students work Monday-Friday, usually 10 a.m.-4 p.m. Nights and weekends are predominantly staffed by men from the freshman and sophomore ranks with women from the same classes well represented. With regular employees having schedules which normally fall in the Monday-Friday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m. shift, it is safe to assume that most students work during the same period as the majority of full-time employees. It is also safe to assume, however, that in the 5 p.m.-midnight schedule, the majority of staffing is done by students. The same is true of weekends. For nights and weekends, the URI Library depends heavily on students for staffing. Two professional reference librarians work Monday-Thursday nights 6 p.m.-10 p.m. in the

reference unit. Friday nights the library is closed. No professional librarians work on Saturday, although clerical or support staff are on duty. One professional reference librarian and several support staff are on duty Sunday during the academic year from 1 p.m. (when the library opens) until 10 p.m. .The library closes at midnight Sunday-Thursday during the regular academic year. The survey also indicates that there is not a department in the library which does not utilize student employees.

Library Student Employees--Staff Perceptions

To understand more fully the role of the student worker in the URI Library, staff members responsible for hiring, training and supervision of student employees were surveyed concerning their perceptions of library student workers. First, all Library unit heads (acquisitions, cataloging, government publications, media, reference, special collections, and administrative offices) were sent a form asking them to identify those persons on their staff responsible for hiring, training, and supervision of library student employees. Twenty staff members were identified as "student employee coordinators." Of the 20 staff members identified, 18 (90%) were ranked as support staff (paraprofessional/clerical) and 2 (10%) were ranked as faculty (professional librarians). The 20 "coordinators" received a questionnaire with instructions to answer the questions about library student employees based on their perceptions rather than by studying student hiring records. After one follow-up memo, 19 of the 20 questionnaires were returned, for a return rate of 95% (Not all respondents answered all questions, so totals for some individual questions are less than 19). The data concerning perceptions of the

staff responsible for hiring/training/supervision of library student employees is based on responses to this questionnaire.

Two principal concerns were noted by respondents. First, persons responsible for hiring student employees were not necessarily the same as the person(s) responsible for training and supervising the employees. Therefore, some respondents did not fill out the entire questionnaire. Second, some respondents had been in their positions only a short time (2-6 months) and did not feel qualified to answer the questions. They filled out the questionnaire to the best of their ability. Because a high turn-over rate among staff responsible for student employees has been a continuing problem, it was determined that this factor represented the typical situation.

Responses

The following is an overview of responses to each of the four sections and a brief discussion of their implications.

Section A. Initial Hiring. Individual library staff members hire from 1 to 80 student employees, with an average of 10.5 students hired per staff member. An average of 2.3 students apply for each position filled, with an average of 1.9 students interviewed for each position filled. Several methods are used by the hiring staff to screen applicants. The most frequently used method is the interview which is used by 16 people (73%). Two people (9%) reported using an informal test of library skills, and no one indicated using a written test. Since less than two students are interviewed for each position filled, the pool of potential applicants is minimal and there is not much choice for the hiring staff. In this situation, it is not

surprising that no one gives a written test of library skills to screen applicants.

Four respondents (20%) required or preferred library experience for initial hires, while 15 did not and 1 "did not care" (80%). Of those who did prefer library experience, the respondents' perception was that 0-25% of the students actually had experience. About half the staff responsible for hiring student workers required or preferred some sort of specialized skills for the students they hired. The types of skills preferred included typing (30%), familiarity with library systems (26%), knowledge of special equipment such as copiers or microform readers (13%), experience with microcomputers or computer systems (4%), and "other": interpersonal skills, office skills, etc., (26%). The majority of those responding (53%) perceived that 25-100% of the students they hired had "some skills." Again, the small pool of applicants tends to make requirements for specialized skills unrealistic. Staff are more likely to find students with some general office skills and depend on training to prepare student workers for specific library tasks.

Library policy indicates that students who qualify for CWS (the library pays only 20% of the student's wage) are to be preferred in hiring over students paid on the IPR. Of the staff doing the hiring, 59% reported that they preferred CWS students, 23% preferred IPR students, and 18% "didn't care." Of students hired, the majority of the staff (67%) reported that they actually hired 50-75% CWS students. Fourteen (78%) of the hiring staff prefer to hire undergraduate students, although two people preferred graduate students, and two "didn't care." Of the students actually hired, 63% of respondents reported that they hired 95-100% undergraduates.

Section B. Training/Supervision. Most library student employees (96%) work up to 15 hours per week. Of the library staff responsible for training, the majority (65%) report that they spend 1-4 hours training student workers, although 4 (20%) reported spending less than one hour, and 2 (10%) 5-10 hours, and 1 (5%) more than 10 hours. Ninety percent of the staff trainers responded that they train students individually. The use of a written instruction guide or manual was indicated by 42% of respondents, while 53% indicated no use of written instructions. When training is completed, the majority of staff supervisors (85%) reported spending 1-4 hours per week supervising student employees and checking their work.

Staff perceptions concerning training differ markedly from the student survey, in which 56.9% of the student employees responded that they received no formal training. Definition of "formal training" may explain this discrepancy. Staff may perceive "individual" training with no written instructions as fulfilling their assignment, while students perceive this sort of instruction as "no formal training." The combination of (often) inexperienced trainers and inexperienced student employees underscores the need for a written instruction guide or manual for all student employees and staff trainers.

Section C. Retention. Library staff perceptions of the length of time "most of your student employees stay in their jobs" emphasized longer term student employees. No one reported "less than one semester" or "one semester". Rather, 45% reported that most of their student employees stayed 1-2 years and 55% reported more than 2 years. Similarly, 69% of respondents believed that 90-100% of their students stayed long enough to merit a raise in pay. (A basic pay

raise of 10 cents per hour is automatic for student employees after one year, although exceptional students may be granted more.) These staff perceptions differ somewhat from the composite portrait of student employees obtained from the student survey: 52.3% worked 1 semester; 10.7%, 1 year; 20%, 2 years; 10.7%, 3 years; and 4.6%, 4 years.

When asked why student employees leave, the supervisors perceived that students leave because of unhappiness with the job (quitting or termination) 25% of the time. Graduation, class schedule conflicts, etc. accounted for 75% of the losses, in their view.

Section D. Benefits-Disadvantages of Student Workers.

Student employee coordinators perceive that there are certain advantages to having student workers in the Library. The primary advantage perceived by the supervisors (32%) was that students "can do routine chores; free staff for other work." Other advantages noted were that students work hours when full-time staff is not available (15%); they are easily trained and they can help other students (13% each); and they learn library routines that help them in their studies (18%). Only 8% of the respondents felt that students have "special skills that supplement the staff."

The major disadvantages listed by the respondents included the perception that students "don't maintain their work schedule" (25%), that the "turn-over rate is too high" (22%) and that they "lack commitment to their work" (19%).

Section E. Evaluation. URI Library policy requires supervisors to complete a one-page Student Performance Evaluation Form for each student employee once each semester and at the time a student terminates employment in the Library. The evaluation form 1)

identifies the student and her/his job title; 2) ranks the student's job performance (quantity of work, quality of work, reliability, initiative and attitude) on a three-point scale; 3) indicates if the student would be rehired; and 4) requires signatures of the student, supervisor and unit head. Oral evaluation of student employee performance is among the duties of the supervisor during training and supervision. Although the Student Performance Evaluation Form is not elaborate and requires only a few minutes to fill out, it includes all pertinent data and is kept on file in the Library. The form is used for rehiring decisions, to assist in identifying students who request references, and to resolve any potential disagreements between student employees and the Library. With a high turnover of student employees, it is important to maintain this basic record of each student's identity and performance.

Review of the Literature

Results of a survey of student employees in major U.S. academic libraries conducted nearly twenty years ago by William H. Williams, bears a striking similarity to the results of the URI surveys of 1986 and 1987.[2] All three surveys indicate that most academic libraries rely heavily on students to help carry their workloads. All three surveys indicate that students are employed in a variety of positions and have varying degrees of responsibilities. Each survey also indicates that training of student employees varies in quality and academic libraries do little to set standards for student employees. In short, nothing has really changed over at least the past twenty years with regard to the condition of student employment in academic

libraries. Much of the literature written on student employment in academic libraries during those intervening years seem to concur.

In the late Sixties and early Seventies, the literature saw students as colleagues, "companions in learning" and urged serious on the job training for these "colleagues".[3] In the mid-Seventies, students were seen as a supplemental workforce ideal for assisting professionals but only after training, testing and evaluation.[4] Around the same time, the Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, Systems and Procedures Exchange Center also issued a Spec Kit on student assistants designed to help supervise and train what they see as essential support staff.[5] The late Seventies saw the publication of an article on student assistants by Michael and Jane Kathman. The Kathmans offer suggestions on analyzing the problems of student workers by using management theory. They also suggest--much like those before them--closer attention be paid to hiring, training and supervision of student workers.[6] In 1983, OMS virtually updates its 1976 study on student assistants but the message is essentially the same: training and supervision.[7] The Kathmans recently wrote that the key to the success for student workers in academic libraries is adequate training and proper supervision.[8] Again and again, the literature tells us how important student employees are to the success of academic libraries. What is lacking in the case of many academic libraries is the proper training, supervision and evaluation of student employees, according to many previously published studies.

CONCLUSIONS

The major reason that most of the literature continues to report poor management when it comes to student workers in academic

libraries is the perennial clash between theory and reality. The literature repeatedly calls for pre-screening among a pool of applicants to select the best. The literature recommends well constructed and defined training programs to produce a competent, long-term student support staff. And the literature expects on-going evaluation to weed out poor workers and retain only the most capable. That's the theory. No one denies that these proposals would provide for selecting, training, and maintaining an ideal student workforce for an academic library. But in reality, there is a vast difference between what the literature recommends and the conditions which actually exist. The data from the URI surveys suggest that the situation facing academic libraries is far from the theoretical ideal.

With less than two students interviewed for each position filled, selection of the best from a large pool of potential student workers is not possible. Rather, it is becoming increasingly difficult to find enough students to fill the essentially unskilled positions that are necessary to keep an academic library functioning.

A shortage of student workers does exist and the economy of the marketplace in the mid- to late-1980's is in many ways responsible. As library budgets have become tighter, it is imperative that libraries keep their personnel budgets down. Hiring student workers at the minimum wage keeps these costs as low as possible. We must compete in the marketplace with businesses which also recruit heavily for part-time student help. A telephone survey of several local merchants was conducted in October, 1987. All of these businesses hire part-time help, about half paying new employees above minimum wage. Some offer bonuses and most offer raises of $0.25-$1.50/hour

after less than one year's work. Libraries and educational institutions which are tied to minimum wage are finding it harder to compete for the dwindling supply of student workers. In fact, as minimum wage rates have risen and CWS-qualified students become harder to find, libraries are paying more for less hours of student work.[9]

Most student employees work only 8-15 hours per week in short blocks of time, a condition of work poorly designed for undertaking complex projects. Schedules are arranged around the students' class and study hours. With little choice of potential employees, the hiring authority often chooses virtually anyone whose schedule meets the Library's needs. Pre-testing and elaborate screening techniques or requirements for previous experience and special skills are unrealistic in these circumstances.

The high turn-over rate of student workers found in the student and staff perception surveys indicates that training is indeed an important requisite in effective use of student employees. These data suggest, however, that training cannot be provided in one intensive series at the beginning of the semester but must be an on-going program throughout the year. An elaborate evaluation process to weed out marginal performers although admirable in theory, is inappropriate in conditions of scarcity. A simple procedure for assuring a basic minimum of competence is sufficient under these conditions.

Since the majority of student employees are used for performing necessary routine tasks, the responsibility for hiring, training, and supervision at URI has fallen on support staff. Except in a very few instances (such as students who are trained for reference desk duty),

librarians in a medium-sized university library have delegated this responsibility. Although ultimately responsible for the efficient operation of the library, librarians rarely work closely with most student employees. A "collegial" relationship between librarian and student employee under these circumstances--no matter how desirable--is largely a myth.

The effective and efficient use of the Library's workforce dictates the delegation of responsibility for different levels of work to different levels of staff. The role of the professional librarian has changed over the years since the Williams study. Many tasks performed by librarians in the 1960's are now accomplished by support staff or students. Librarians today interact with teaching faculty in collection development and bibliographic instruction. They provide reference service and organize the library's collection through the use of complex systems. They are responsible for research and publication. They supervise units made up entirely of support staff and students. Librarians must be aware of the factors which affect the utilization of student employees and work within the constraints imposed by them.

In the 1980's, elaborate programs for professional librarians to screen, train, and supervise student employees as suggested by the literature do not constitute effective utilization of the library's human resources. The librarian/manager/leader must set certain minimum standards: a basic set of written instructions for staff supervisors and student employees, and a performance evaluation which assures a minimum of competence. We would suggest that academic libraries, rather than mismanaging the student workforce, are

investing the optimum amount of resources necessary to assure the continued effective and efficient functioning of the institution.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. "Library Student Employment--Staff Questionnaire", (Kingston: University of Rhode Island Library, 1987. Unpublished document.)

2. "Library Student Employment--Student Questionnaire", (Kingston: University of Rhode Island Library, 1987. Unpublished document.)

3. Keith M. Cottam, "Student Employees in Academic Libraries," College and Research Libraries 31(4):246-248 (July 1970).

4. William F. Heinlen, "Using Student Assistants in Academic Reference," RQ 15:323-325 (Summer 1976).

5. Support Staff and Student Assistants, SPEC Kit 30. Washington, D.C.: ARL, Office of Management Studies, 1976.

6. Michael D. Kathman and Jane M. Kathman, "Management Problems of Student Workers in Academic Libraries," College and Research Libraries 39:118-122 (March 1978).

7. Student Assistants in ARL Libraries, SPEC Kit 91. Washington, D.C.: ARL, Office of Management Studies, 1983.

8. Michael D. Kathman and Jane M. Kathman, "Integrating Student Employees into the Management Structure of Academic Libraries," Catholic Library World 56:328-330 (March 1985).

9. "Library Student Assistant Monthly Payroll Report," (Kingston: University of Rhode Island Library, 1983-1987. Unpublished document.)

URI LIBRARY STUDENT WORKERS: A QUESTIONNAIRE

We would like to know about your working experience in the Library. This is an anonymous survey but we would appreciate your cooperation in completing answers as fully as possible.

1. What Library department do you work in? Circle the appropriate answer(s).

Reference	Circulation Desk	Cataloging	Administration
Govt.Pubs	Circulation Stacks	Bindery	Reserves
Mform	Acquisitions Receiving	Processing	Spec.Collections
Interlibrary Loan	Acquisitions Searching	Serials	Other_____
	Current Periodical Rm.	Mailroom	

2. How many hours do you work per week?_____

3. What days in the week do you work?_____

4. What hours on those days? (e.g., Mon.-8am to 12pm)_____

5. How is your job funded? (Circle one) IPR Work Study Other

6. What are your responsibilities

7. Did you receive any special training? Examples?

8. Has your employment here helped you in your academic work?

9. Circle the appropriate answer: "I am a..."
Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Grad Student

10. Is your permanent residence: R. I. Out of State Non-U.S.

11. Male? Female? (Circle)

12. How long have you worked at the URI Library?

13. Any previous library experience?

14. What is (or what will be) your major field of study?

15. Comments:

Thank you!

Vocino
11/86

LIBRARY STUDENT EMPLOYMENT -- STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

Please respond to this questionnaire based on your experience with the library student employees you hire, train, and/or supervise. It is not necessary to supply exact numbers from hiring records; just fill in the questionnaire to the best of your ability from your experience with student employees in your unit.

A. Initial hiring

1. About how many student employees do you hire each semester? _____
2. About how many students apply for each position you fill? _____
3. About how many students do you interview for each position you fill? _____
4. What payroll category of student do you prefer to hire?
   a. Work-Study _____. b. IPR _____.
5. About what percentage of each category do you actually hire?
   a. Work-Study _____% b. IPR _____%
6. What academic level of students do you prefer to hire?
   a. Undergraduate _____. B. Graduate _____.
7. About what percentage of each level do you hire?
   a. Undergraduate _____% b. Graduate _____%
8. Do you require or prefer library experience for students initially hired?
   a. Yes. _____ b. No. _____
9. If yes, about what percentage of initial hires actually have previous library experience? _____%
10. Do you require or prefer specialized skills for students initially hired?
    a. Yes. _____.
    b. No. _____. (If no, go on to Question 13.)
11. If yes, what skills do you require or prefer? (Check all that apply.)
    a. Typing _____.
    b. Familiarity with special equipment (Mform readers, copiers, labeling, laminating equipment, etc.) _____.
    c. Familiarity with microcomputers or computer systems _____.
    d. Familiarity with library systems (LC or SuDoc classification, CLSI, OCLC, reference tools, etc.) _____.
    e. Other (please specify) _____.
12. About what percentage of students actually have preferred skills?
    a. All skills _____% b. Some skills _____% c. No skills _____%
13. How do you screen student applicants?
    a. Interview _____.
    b. Informal test of library skills (typing, filing, searching, etc.)_____.
    c. Written test of library skills _____.
    d. Other (please specify) _____.

B. Training/Supervision

1. About how many hours per week does each of your students work?
   a. 0-9 hours _____.
   b. 10-15 hours _____.
   c. 16-20 hours _____.
2. Do you train students individually or in groups?
   a. Individually _____.
   b. In groups _____.
3. Do you use a written instruction guide or manual?
   a. Yes _____. b. No _____.
4. About how much time do you spend in training each student?
   a. Less than 1 hour _____.
   b. 1-4 hours _____.
   c. 5-10 hours _____.
   d. More than 10 hours _____.
5. When training is completed, about how much time per week do you spend supervising each student and checking her/his work?
   a. Less than 1 hour/week _____.
   b. 1-4 hours/week _____.
   c. 5-10 hours/week _____.
   d. More than 10 hours/week _____.

C. Retention.

1. How long do most of your student employees stay in their jobs?
   a. Less than 1 semester _____.
   b. 1 semester _____.
   c. 1 year _____.
   d. 2 years _____.
   e. More than 2 years _____.
2. About what percentage of your student employees work well enough and stay long enough to merit a raise in pay? _____%
3. Why do your students leave their jobs? (Check all that apply.)
   a. Class schedule conflicts _____.
   b. Found another job _____.
   c. Graduate _____.
   d. Unhappy in the job; quit _____.
   e. Did not perform satisfactorily; terminated _____.
   f. Other (please specify) _____.

D. Benefits and disadvantages of student employees.

1. What do you feel are some of the benefits of hiring student workers? (Check all that apply.)
   a. They can work hours when full-time staff is not available (evenings, weekends) _____.
   b. They can do routine chores; free staff for other work ___.
   c. They are easily trained _____.
   d. They can help other students _____.
   e. They have special skills that can supplement the staff _____.
   f. They learn library routines that help them in their studies ____.
   g. Other (please specify)_____
   _____.

2. What do you feel are some of the disadvantages of hiring student workers? (Check all that apply.)
   a. Too much time required for hiring _____.
   b. Too much time required for training _____.
   c. They require too much supervision _____.
   d. Turn-over rate is too high _____.
   e. They don't consistently maintain their work schedule _____.
   f. They lack commitment to their work _____.
   g. Other (please specify) _____
   _____.

E. Comments. If you wish to expand on any of your answers or add additional comments concerning your experience with library student employees, please use the space below:

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire. Please fill in your name/unit and return by Friday, October 9, 1987. Place in the attached envelope and drop in local mail for return to me (Marty Kellogg).

Name _____ Unit _____

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

University of Rhode Island

Student Performance Evaluation

Name:_____ Social Security #:_____

Department/Section:_____

Job Title (Describe duties briefly if not evident from title):_____

_____

Period Under Review:_____

	Exceeds Objective	Meets Objective	Does Not Meet Objective
1. QUANTITY OF WORK: (Maintains a pace adequate to accomplish all assigned tasks within work period; is able to accommodate normal work flow)	____	____	____
2. QUALITY OF WORK: (Performs tasks with precision and neatness; meets all responsibilities; all facets of job are executed correctly and in the appropriate sequence)	____	____	____
3. RELIABILITY: (Is punctual; adheres to an agreed upon schedule)	____	____	____
4. INITIATIVE: (Commences necessary actions without direction; exercises independent, appropriate judgment in problem situations)	____	____	____
5. ATTITUDE: (Works harmoniously with staff members at all levels; displays a visibly friendly and helpful attitude toward patrons; is invariably polite and patient)	____	____	____

Would you rehire this employee? Yes ____ No ____

If not, why?_____

_____

Employee Signature_____ Date_____

Supervisor Signature_____ Date_____

Unit Head Signature_____ Date_____

University of Rhode Island, Kingston, Rhode Island 02881
University Library

MEMORANDUM TO STUDENT LIBRARY EMPLOYEES

The University Library provides part-time employment to students certified by the Student Financial Aid Office. To familiarize yourself with your working conditions and benefits, please carefully read the following information.

Status of Student Employees

Student Library Employees are an integral part of the staffing pattern of the Library. They are hired in positions reserved for the employment of students who are enrolled in the University. Appointments are made on a year to year basis, and end on the last day of the Spring Semester. Continuation into the Summer, or through a subsequent academic year, will depend upon recertification by SFAO, and the amount and kind of work available. Student Library Employees who have demonstrated an excellent work performance will be given preference. All positions and work hours are subject to change because of fluctuating workloads or budget adjustments.

Wages

All student library employees are hired at the prevailing minimum wage. Those positions categorized as "supervisors" receive a $ .20/hour premium (this designation appears on the SFA/EI form posted in the Student Financial Aid Office). Longevity increases of $ .10/hour are awarded in September.

Hours of Work

No student employee may work more than 20 hours/week during a semester. Students are normally scheduled to work 8 to 15 hours per week depending upon the needs of the department during various times in the semester. While students should not commit themselves to work schedules which would be detrimental to their scholastic records, it is their responsibility to adhere to a mutually agreed upon schedule. Students should be aware that adherence to the schedule throughout the entire academic year is an important criteria in performance review and retention/rehiring decisions.

Payday

Payday is the second Wednesday in every month for hours worked during the previous month. Paychecks are issued in the Library Administrative Office after 11 a.m. on that

day. There is a schedule of paydays posted at the time clock.

You must pick up your own paycheck and sign the ledger sheet. This is for your own protection.

Substitutions

Arrangements for the exchange or substitution of hours should be made in advance with your supervisor. Exchanges are permitted only when another qualified person is available. Substitution should occur infrequently and only as a result of emergency situations. It is essential that student library employees meet the approved schedule.

Time Cards

Your time card is the official record of hours worked. It is your responsibility to clock in and out accurately. If you make an error, take your time card to your supervisor or unit head for correction. Falsification of time cards is a serious offense.

Breaks

Fifteen minute rest periods at the convenience of the department are allowed students working four or more consecutive hours. The rest periods are for relief and refreshment of the staff during working hours. They cannot be accumulated or used for other purposes such as leaving early or adjusting work schedules. The staff lounge is available for use during breaks, lunch and dinner periods. Students are not allowed to work more than five consecutive hours without clocking out for at least half-hour lunch or dinner break. No time card will be processed, without validation by your supervisor, if more than five consecutive hours appear on your time card.

Performance Evaluation

Your supervisor will evaluate your performance from time to time. Formal written evaluations are required at the time of separation from Library employment (usually during May). During the evaluation process you will have an opportunity to discuss your performance with your supervisor. These evaluations are part of your work record and are used regularly when prospective employers request employment references. We invite you to call these to the attention of employers when you apply for positions in the future.

*

In accord with SFAO Policy #16 (11/20/81)